OIPE 480 NOV 2 1 2005

AF 1 (09-04) TW

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE der the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a c ollection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 09/747.770 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL December 22, 2000 First Named Inventor **FORM** Ron J. Vandergeest Art Unit 2134 Examiner Name Thomas M. Ho (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 0500.0008171 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC ~ Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer **Extension of Time Request** below): -return postcard Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. Signature Printed name Christopher J. Reckamp Date Reg. No. 34.414 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature Christine A. Wright 11-17-05 Typed or printed name

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





Applicants: Ron J. Vandergeest et al.

Serial No.: 09/747,770

Filing Date: December 22, 2000

Confirmation No.: 4395

Examiner: Thomas M. Ho

Art Group: 2134

Docket No.: 0500.0008171 Our File No.: 10500.00.8171

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING USER AUTHENTICATION

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of First Class Mailing I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

AFTER FINAL RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed September 7, 2005, Applicants submit the following remarks.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 27-31 are allowed.

Claims 1-4 and 6-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) under Crane et al. Crane has been cited as teaching all of the claim limitations of, for example, claim 1, but the office action admits that Crane fails to disclose, returning the authentication code to the authentication unit. The office action admits that Crane discloses that merely a simple yes or no is returned that is digitally signed. However, the office action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to send the returned authentication code instead of the yes/no answer. However, such a modification to Crane would cause Crane to